

as a few policy changes that we believe are necessary to implement the Act as intended. There are also a number of policy changes that were recommended to us that have not been included in this bill, and I expect that some will be disappointed at their exclusion. However, in crafting this legislation, we have worked to ensure that the bill is bipartisan, that it is fully paid for, that it will benefit students, and that it will be signed into law.

For example, I feel very strongly that the Department is not following our intent with respect to direct loan origination fees. Now, before this is taken out of context, let me be clear; I support better terms and conditions for students. The 1998 amendments were designed to provide students with the best possible deal under very tight budget constraints, and I believe we succeeded in doing that. However, the law is very clear in directing the Secretary to collect a four percent origination fee on direct student loans.

This is confirmed in legal opinions from the Congressional Research Service and the Comptroller General. It was not our intent to change that, and in my view the Department's action sets a very dangerous precedent. The fact that this legislation does not address this issue should not be taken as an endorsement of the Department's actions.

The legislation we are introducing today does make a needed change to the "return of federal funds" provisions in the Higher Education Act to help students who withdraw before the end of a term. Specifically, it corrects the Department's interpretation and clarifies that students are never required to return more than 50 percent of the grant funds they received. Again, I know there are those who would like us to go further. However, doing so would have mandatory spending implications that we have no way to pay for, and in many instances would result in students leaving school with increased student loan debt.

This bill will also modify the campus crime reporting provisions of the Act to provide parents and students with information on schools' policies regarding the handling of reports on missing students. Specifically, information will be provided on a school's policy on parental notification as well as its policy for investigating such reports and cooperating with local police. I have a long history of trying to ensure that parents have the information they need to make sure that their children are safe on campus, and I have worked closely with my colleague, Mr. Andrews, to craft this version of "Bryan's Law" so that it gives parents this information without overly burdening schools.

Finally, I would also note that we have included the provisions of H.R. 3629, the Tribal College Amendments, which we marked up last month and which passed the House under suspension of the rules. These provisions will streamline grant applications for Tribal Colleges under Title III and allow institutions to apply for a new grant without waiting for two years. We have included them again here because we are uncertain whether the other body will act on H.R. 3629 in a timely manner. I also note that this bill contains similar treatment for Hispanic Serving Institutions under Title V, and I thank our colleague, MARK GREEN of Wisconsin, for bringing this issue to our attention.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

I also want to thank Mr. CLAY, Mr. McKEON, and Mr. MARTINEZ for their efforts in crafting this bipartisan legislation. This bill will not satisfy everyone completely. But it does make necessary technical and policy changes that will improve the implementation of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, and it does so in a way that will benefit students and that is likely to be enacted. I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to support this legislation.

COMMENDING MASTER CHIEF ANDE HARTLEY

HON. ROY BLUNT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2000

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, today I commend Master Chief Ande Hartley of the United States Navy upon his retirement after twenty-one years of service and duty to our country. Ande carried out that duty as a submariner.

Being a member of a submarine crew for two decades is no small accomplishment. It is well known among members of our armed forces that submarine duty may be among the toughest and most challenging assignments in the Navy. After all, in most other assignments in the Navy, there is usually an opportunity to leave your station for a few hours and have time alone. When you are aboard a submarine there is no opportunity for retreat from one's responsibilities.

Ande's specific duties as a Machinist Mate aboard a nuclear submarine were to make sure that the mechanical systems of the submarine ran properly. All though I am not aware of all those responsibilities, I want to be sure and mention the importance of running the propulsion plant spacers and ensuring that all mechanics associated with the reactor plant were in proper working order. If a qualified member of the crew had not carried out these duties correctly, then this ship would be unable to perform its covert operations for the Navy that are so vital to the freedom of this nation.

Without reservation Mr. Speaker, I can say that Master Chief Ande Hartley has performed his duties well. I am sure there were days he realized he could pursue other employment opportunities and earn better pay, and benefits as well as enjoy more time with his family and friends. For Ande though, true commitment is more than pay and benefits, it is about the preservation of the freedom we enjoy so that our family and friends will have the opportunities they now have in the future.

Ande's sacrifices are without doubt noteworthy and commendable. His commitment is an example that his family, friends and fellow sailors can follow as a pattern in their own lives. Thank you Ande for serving your country so faithfully, for so many years. It is an example we can all follow.

CONCERN FOR 13 MEMBERS OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY WHO ARE ON TRIAL

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2000

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues the deep concern that I have for 13 members of the Jewish community in Iran who are on trial for a crime I do not believe they have committed. Iran's arbitrary charges against these thirteen individuals endangers that country's entire Jewish community and is an offense to world Jewry. The trial takes place at the same time when the world honors those who were lost to the Holocaust and vows never to let such atrocities of hate recur.

I am encouraged by the fact that so many of my colleagues have taken a role of moral leadership on this issue, and have expressed their outrage to the Administration and to Iranian authorities. This past week, members of Congress took further steps to emphasize how seriously this trial can affect Iran's status. We wrote to the World Bank and contacted nations on the bank's loan approval board to urge postponement of pending loans for development projects in Iran. Unfortunately, those loans were approved. I am grateful that representatives of numerous nations that were present expressed concern over the trial. The outcome of this trial will not be overlooked by members of Congress or the Jewish and human rights communities.

The future for these thirteen individuals does not look promising. No matter what the outcome of this trial is, I will never forget Iran's behavior and will take this matter into account as I make foreign policy decisions that affect that country. I commend to my colleagues an article written by Douglas Bloomfield for the Chicago Jewish Star. Mr. Bloomfield's column is usually full of great information and insight, this one is particularly compelling and is worthy of members' attention.

SHOA TRIAL

(By Douglas M. Bloomfield)

There was something deeply troubling and yet fitting that as Jews around the world last week remembered the Six Million who perished in the Holocaust, the Ayatollahs began the trial of 13 Jews accused of spying for Israel. It was a dramatic reminder that Jews remain endangered in some parts of the world.

The time and place were appropriate. Iran is where a long-ago Hitler once concocted genocidal plans for the Jews of the Persian Empire. Just a few weeks ago, Haman's modern descendants declared the ancient vizier was really an Egyptian, not unlike the Austrians trying to convince the world Hitler was really a German.

The trial of 13 men accused on trumped up espionage charges opened on a dramatic note with the televised confessions, outside the courtroom, of first, one man and then two more and other followed, all dutifully denying coercion.

It was an alarming development unabashedly offered by a regime that wanted the world to see the confessions but not the trial.

Naturally, the "confessed" spies declared that their admissions were voluntary; what would one expect from a man who'd been in an Iranian jail for some 15 months, never allowed to see his lawyer?

It was reminiscent of Iran's Lebanese allies distributing videotapes of their American hostages pleading guilty to sundry offenses, and North Vietnam staging televised war crime confessions by American POW's.

No court in any civilized country would consider such confessions to be valid, but then again few would call Iran "civilized."

If the Iranian charges were true and the confessions freely given, there would be no reason to keep the evidence and the trial secret.

The defense attorney for one of the three said that under Islamic law and international norms, a confession given by a prisoner after more than a year in jail is invalid.

International attention is focused on the courtroom in the southern city of Shiraz. President Clinton has repeatedly spoken out, as have Members of Congress, the nation's governors and many mayors and other public officials.

Secretary of State Madeleine Albright last week warned Iranian leaders the trial "will have repercussions everywhere" on that country's efforts to "earn international respect." That came in the same week that her department officially reaffirmed Iran's status as a leading state sponsor of international terrorism.

Other leaders have made serious and personal efforts to help: the Pope, UN Secretary General Kofi Anan, Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak, Prime

More than 60 journalists, human rights activists and diplomats from the around the globe stood vigil outside the locked doors of a legal system controlled by the most extreme factions in that country. Inside, the lives of 13 Jews were in the hands of a single man who sits as prosecutor, judge and jury.

Israel has privately assured the United States the men are innocent and it is unaware of any links between the accused and Israeli officials. Charges that they also spied for the United States have apparently been dropped.

Some of the international pressure is apparently getting attention in Tehran. That's why the prisoners were presented on television confessing. It may also explain why the trial was adjourned for Passover, not exactly a national holiday in the fervently Islamic state, and why the three youngest defendants were released on bail. Trials in Iran usually last hours, not weeks as this one is expected to. The court could have declared them guilty and quickly hanged them, as happened three years ago with two other Jews similarly charged.

But will those gestures, aimed at the international community, be enough to save the lives of these men? What do these gestures mean?

The hard-liners have never shown much sensitivity to world opinion. In fact, they seem to revel in sticking their thumbs in the eyes of public opinion, especially American and Israeli eyes.

Just before the trial began, a leading cleric delivered a sermon over state radio declaring, "These people are spies . . . they are Jews and are . . . by nature enemies of Muslims."

These 13 Jews are pawns in a battle between the hard-line Islamic extremists and the reformers, who scored another important victory in last Friday's runoff elections, for control of an ancient land whose chief ex-

ports of late have been religious bigotry and terrorism. One thing the ruling ayatollahs and the reformers led by President Khatemi seem to agree on is their hatred of Israel.

If the verdicts are guilty, which carries a death penalty, some fear the ayatollahs declare that all Jews are Zionists, and the Zionist state is the mortal enemy of Islam and Iran, and thus all Jews are enemies and spies.

Iran wages daily war against Israel through proxies such as Hezbollah. Supreme leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei said again recently the only way to solve the problems of the Middle East is to annihilate Israel.

As the trial in Shiraz opened, there was an event worth noting in another country with a long and bitter history of anti-Semitism: Poland. Some 5,000 young Jews from around the world, led by the presidents of Israel and Poland, took part in the annual March of the Living from Auschwitz to Birkenau to honor those who perished solely for the crime of being Jews.

Just weeks earlier, a British judge struck an important blow for the cause of truth and morality, a blow in an ongoing battle against Holocaust denial that should never have been necessary.

Other nations are at long last beginning to come to terms with their Holocaust guilt and with Holocaust denial; throughout the Arab world, however, denial is a surging companion to rising anti-Semitism, often officially encouraged as in Egypt and Syria.

In this country, too, we have made tremendous progress in confronting the scourge of anti-Semitism, but there are counter-forces, including a presidential candidate who admires Hitler, belittles the Holocaust and blames the Jews for dragging America into World War II.

The trial of the Iran 13 is an alarming reminder that for all the lessons learned from the tragic past, there remain places where Hitler's work is commended, not condemned. It is a clarion warning of our responsibility to stand guard on the legacy of Hitler's victims in Iran and around the world.

VIEJAS BAND OF KUMEYAAY INDIANS: SPIRIT OF COOPERATION AWARD

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2000

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, today I recognize the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians, as it is honored by the San Diego-Imperial Counties Labor Council, AFL-CIO, at its 12th annual Worker's Memorial Dinner with its Spirit of Cooperation Award.

The Viejas Indian Casino recently signed a contract with the Communications Workers of America Local 9400, in what is possibly the first ever union contract with any Tribal Casino in the United States. Not only did Viejas sign an agreement with the union allowing it to organize workers at the casino, but they also gave the union space for a temporary organizing office on the property and allowed the union easy access to the employees.

After the representation election, Viejas and the union successfully negotiated a contract that provides good wages, benefits, and union

representation to employees. Viejas has been model of employer attitude and has forced a truly special relationship with the union.

Viejas has also been a leader in supporting community efforts through their charitable giving programs and active participation in community and business associations.

My congratulations go to the Viejas Bank of Kumeyaay Indians for these significant contributions.

FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE CLARIFICATION ACT

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2000

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a bill that would make reasonable, and much needed change to the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) of 1993. The Family and Medical Leave Clarification Act will help implement and enforce the FMLA in a manner consistent with Congress' original intent.

I do not think anyone would dispute that the FMLA has helped those with serious family and medical crisis. However, some of the troublesome results are difficult to ignore. There is compelling evidence of problems with the implementation and the FMLA, problems affecting both employers and employees. The FMLA is still a relatively young law. In fact, the final rule implementing the Act was not published until 1995. As with any new law, there are some growing pains that need to be sorted out.

Testimony before the Committee on Education and the Workforce has established evidence of myriad problems in the workplace caused by the FMLA. These problems include: the administrative burden of allowing leave to be taken in increments of as little as six minutes; the additional burdens from overly broad and confusing regulations of the FMLA, not the least of which is the Department of Labor's ever-expanding definition of "serious health condition;" and inequities stemming from employers with generous leave policies in effect being penalized under the FMLA for having those policies.

Mr. Speaker, the FMLA created a Commission on Leave, which was charged with reporting the FMLA's impact. Upon release of the Commission's report in April 1996, we were told that all was well with the FMLA. But contrary to these assertions, the report was not a complete picture. In fact the Family and Medical Leave Act Commission admitted its report was only an "initial assessment." Its two year study began in November of 1993, just three months after the Act even applied to most employers and more than a year before the release of final FMLA regulations in January of 1995.

Simply put, the Commission's report was based on old and incomplete data studies long before employers or employees could have been fully aware of the FMLA's many requirements and responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, the first area the FMLA Clarification Act addresses is the Department of Labor's overly broad interpretation of the term